



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

whose career has shown no trace of humanity or usefulness, and has put the capstone of murder on every other crime. And yet we are told it is perfectly right to take a young man of the highest promise, a blessing to all who knew him, the very man to live for his country, and send him to be cut down by a bullet or by dysentery in a cause he cannot approve.

But there is a still newer theory come up about war as applied to ourselves. It seems that we share with a very few other people in the world a civilization so high and institutions so divine that it is our duty and our destiny to go about the globe swallowing up inferior peoples, and bestowing on them, whether they will or not, the blessings of the American — Constitution? Well, no! Not of the American Constitution, but of the American dominion — and that, when we are once started on this work of absorption, they are rebels who do not accept these blessings. Now, if this precious doctrine be true, it utterly annihilates the old notion of patriotism and love of country; for that notion called upon every nation, however small or weak or backward, to maintain to the death its independence against any other, however great or strong or progressive. According to this Mohammedan doctrine, this "death or the Koran" doctrine, the Finns and the Poles are not patriots because they object to being absorbed by Russia, and the Hamburgers were rebels for not accepting the beneficent incorporation into France graciously proffered to them by Marshal Davoust.

But I will not enlarge upon this delicate subject of modern Americanism. It is bad enough for the nations we threaten to absorb. It is worse for us, the absorbers. I will ask you to remember what befell a noble nation which took up the work of benevolently absorbing the world.

When Xerxes had been driven back in tears to Persia, his rout released scores of Greek islands and cities in the loveliest of lands and seas and inhabited by the brightest and wisest of men. There is nothing in art or literature or science or government that did not take its rise from them. Their tyrant gone, they looked round for a protector. They saw that Athens was mighty on the sea, and they heard that she was just and generous to all who sought her citadel. And they put themselves, their ships and treasure, in the power of Athens, to use them as she would for the common defense. And the league was scarcely formed, the Persian was but just crushed, when the islands began to find that protection meant subjection. They could not bear to think that they had only changed masters, even if Aristides himself assigned their tribute; and some revolted. The rebellion was put down; Athens went on expanding; she made her subject islands give money instead of ships, she transferred the treasury to her own citadel, she spent the money of her allies in those marvelous adornments that have made her the crown of beauty for the world forever. Wider and wider did the empire of the Athenian democracy extend. Five armies fought her battles in a single year in five lands; Persia and Egypt, as well as Sparta, feeling the valor of her soldiers. And the heart of Athens got drunk with glory, and the brain of Athens got crazed with power, and the roar of her boasting rose up to heaven joined with the wail of her deceived and trampled subjects. And one by one they

turned and fell from her and joined their arms to her rival, who promised them independence; and every fond and mad endeavor to retain her empire only sucked her deeper into the eddy of ruin, till at length she was brought to her knees before her rival, and her victorious fleet and her impregnable walls were destroyed with the cry that now began the freedom of Greece.

It was only the beginning of new slavery. Enslaved by the faithless Sparta, who sold half the cities back to Persia, patching up once more a hollow alliance with Athens; enslaved by Macedonia, enslaved by Rome, enslaved by the Turks, — poor Greece holds at last what she calls her independence under the protection of the great civilizing nations, who let her live because they cannot agree how to cut up her carcass if they slay her.

Brethren, even as Athens began by protection and passed into tyranny, and then into ruin, so shall every nation be who interprets patriotism to mean that it is the only nation in the world, and that every other that stands in the way of what it chooses to call destiny must be crushed. Love your country, honor her, live for her, — if necessary, die for her; but remember that whatever you would call right or wrong in another country is right and wrong for her and for you, that right and truth and love to man and allegiance to God are above all patriotism, and that every citizen who sustains his country in her sins is responsible to humanity, to history, to philosophy and to Him to whom all nations are as a drop in the bucket and the small dust on the balance.

## Peace Society of the City of New York.

### Luncheon at the Plaza Hotel.

BY WILLIAM H. SHORT, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY.

The luncheon at the Plaza on the 15th of January was well attended. Ex-Secretary of State John W. Foster was unfortunately prevented from fulfilling his engagement by an attack of influenza, but sent his address. Mr. Carnegie was still confined to the house from the effects of his fall in Central Park, and Mr. Horace White, a former editor of the *New York Evening Post*, presided in his place. Addresses were made by Hon. Theodore E. Burton, United States Senator from Ohio, Prof. John B. Clark of the Economic Department of Columbia University, Mr. John Graham Brooks of Cambridge, Mass., Mr. Marcus M. Marks and Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead. We give below extracts from the several addresses:

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON: I congratulate the Peace Society of New York upon the work which it has already done, and upon its plans for the future. I especially approve of the campaign of education which you are now devising and have under way.

The first point on which I wish to lay stress is that a country, the same as an individual, has a mission to perform. In this connection I wish to point out that the United States should take the lead in the great movement for peace, and for the prevention of the intolerable burdens of naval and military armaments. Now what are the advantages which belong to the United States in the cause of peace? First, our magnificent isolation, paradoxical as it may seem. Our detached situation renders us free from the jealousies and rivalries which

belong to countries in close contact with each other. A second advantage which we have is the stimulus of free institutions, and that trend of character which comes from developing the resources of so large a share of a great continent. The third reason — and there are many others — is the greater degree of confidence which other nations place in us as compared with those ruled by kings and with large standing armies. Since 1815 two hundred and fifty treaties of arbitration have been made by which a great variety of troublesome questions have been settled, — disputes about boundaries, indignities to citizens, all those various causes of irritation which in the past have led to war. In these arbitrations we have taken the lead. Our fairness has been relied upon in the settlement of disputes, and I trust that confidence may continue.

I have been asked to say a few words about the business interests of this country in the maintenance of peace, and this is particularly appropriate in your great commercial community. The first phase of that business interest is this: there is more and more solidarity of interest in the whole commercial world. Our States are nearer together to-day than our countries were when the Constitution was framed; the different countries of the world are as near together, almost, as were the States one hundred years ago. In this connection I may state also that the improved means of communication, the better knowledge of each other, tend toward peace.

There have been many complaints about the high cost of living recently, and some very fantastic reasons have been given. I do not say it is the principal cause, but I do say one cause is the increased burden of local and federal taxation; when the point is reached that two-thirds of this great burden of taxation has to do with warlike purposes or the survival of wars, I think we are going a good deal too far. We have a navy sufficient for all emergencies, and who is going to attack us? The triumphs of the past have been triumphs of diplomacy rather than of war. The Monroe Doctrine, now a settled phase of diplomacy, was established and accepted without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a gun. Just as we ask Europeans to keep out of the New World, we in the New are going to keep out of the quarrels and complications of the Old as we have done.

It seems to me that among the nations of the earth the time has come when people should act together; when we should prevent this intolerable burden caused by the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in the preparation for war when the whole trend of the world's thought and progress is against war. A country cannot now, without very strong occasion, engage in conflict. In the last forty or fifty years some countries of Europe engaged in aggressive movements against others, but they were unable to stand up against the condemnation of an enlightened public opinion.

Would it not be well for us all to join hands, as in the days of the Crusades, so that the different nations may take part in bringing about that everlasting principle and teaching of the great Master, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men"?

HON. JOHN W. FOSTER: What I wish to emphasize, in the short time I shall claim your attention, is the importance on the part of peace societies of laboring to

create a strong public sentiment against war, and in favor of settling all our international troubles by peaceful methods. Our opponents assert that war is not only inevitable, but that sometimes it is necessary; that arbitration is merely a method of adjusting minor international differences, and that political questions, involving national policy, honor or territory, must in the extreme resort be determined by the arbitrament of war; and many of them claim that war is not an unmixed evil, as it stimulates patriotism, makes men more virile, reduces the redundant population, and is a healthy stimulus among nations.

I maintain that none of these assertions is well founded, and that we have conclusive arguments to refute all of them. In the few minutes at my command, I desire to consider the first of these assertions — the inevitableness or necessity of war; and I will attempt to illustrate it by the history of our own country.

The Revolutionary War was a revolt from the mother country, and therefore does not fall within the category of foreign wars. And yet, if the controversy which occasioned it had arisen in the last quarter of the nineteenth century in place of the eighteenth, there would have been no necessity for it.

The war of 1812, our first foreign conflict, was far from being inevitable. The better sentiment of the country was opposed to it. The President, Mr. Madison, did all in his power to prevent it, but he was overruled by a few fiery spirits in Congress, known as the "War Hawks." Our armies crossed the Canadian frontier only to be driven back in defeat, and though we gained some glory on the water, the conflict was barren of results, and we made peace without settling a single question about which we entered on the contest. Never was a war more fruitless in its conclusion. It was neither inevitable nor necessary.

It is the judgment of history that our second foreign war — that with Mexico — was provoked on our part, and that it was largely inspired by the spirit of slavery extension. Although the annexation of Texas, a revolted colony of Mexico, led to the armed contest, the immediate cause of the conflict was a disputed question of territory. Without waiting for the result of negotiations, President Polk, with no authority from Congress, sent an army under General Taylor to occupy the disputed territory, and thus precipitated a war which, as I have said, in the judgment of historians, almost without exception, has been pronounced not only unnecessary but unjustifiable.

The Civil War was domestic, not international, in its character, and hence not to be included in our present examination.

The war with Spain possessed some of the characteristics of that of 1812 with Great Britain. The President was strongly opposed to a resort to arms and struggled for peace to the last, but the feeling in Congress and the agitation in the press called loudly for hostilities. I entertain no doubt that the Spanish government would have granted at the end of the negotiations the demand of our government for the complete colonial autonomy of Cuba, and practical independence such as Canada enjoys. The cause of the destruction of the "Maine" has not yet been accurately ascertained. The Spanish government proposed that the question be submitted to an international court of inquiry, but our government declined the

proposal, preferring to rely on the report of our own navy officials. From my acquaintance with the Spanish people, I never have been able to bring myself to believe that the catastrophe was caused by Spanish officials or with their knowledge. There has been an almost criminal neglect on our part to raise the "Maine," whose wreck lies as an unsightly obstruction in the harbor of Havana, with the festering bodies of hundreds of gallant men denied a soldier's burial. From my conversation with officers of high rank in the navy, I am inclined to the belief that our delinquency in this respect is occasioned by the fear that it would be found that the destruction was caused by an internal explosion, and that the war was precipitated by an event for which the Spanish government was in nowise responsible.

This review, I think, shows that all of the foreign wars in which the United States has been engaged were brought on by our own precipitate action, that they were not inevitable, and that they might have been avoided by the exercise of prudence and deliberation. If such is the case, is it not time that every true patriot, every lover of his country and of its fair fame in the world, and every friend of humanity, should strive to curb the spirit of aggression and military glory among our people and seek to create an earnest sentiment against war?

PROF. JOHN B. CLARK: It is not easy to grasp and not possible adequately to measure in words the tremendous power of the economic motives that make for peace between nations. There is the cost of preparation for war. It means beating pruning hooks into swords, and is tantamount to transforming universities, trade schools, libraries, hospitals, research laboratories, and the like into Dreadnoughts and armored cruisers. There is the money outlay incurred by a war, partly while it lasts, partly in the shape of pensions long after it is over. There is the crushing national debt which comes in consequence of this outlay, and the unending taxation that it imposes on the country. There is the devastation of war; that which comes from using the swords instead of the ploughshares, or the Dreadnoughts instead of the instrumentalities that are life-giving and uplifting. And yet each of these wastes, tremendous as it appears when massed in figures, is less important than one other, namely, the disruption of the ties that make the civilized world an organism — international commerce, the international range of action of producing corporations, of financing organizations, of trade unions, and last, but not least, of socialistic bodies. All of these pay scant attention to the imaginary lines that bound a state, and very great attention to the invisible ties that hold humanity together; and they therefore constitute a motive for peace which cannot be estimated and recorded on a monetary balance sheet. Like tearing a physical organism limb from limb is the disruption which comes in our day by war between civilized states.

MR. BROOKS spoke briefly on the new valuation of human life that is being set by the world, and especially in our own country, where, according to the Employers' Liability Acts, it is found by comparison that we kill or maim three, four, five times as many people as in any other country. And in this new valuation there is an ever growing conviction that men are worth more than "food for bullets."

MR. MARKS appealed to the business men to take a more active personal interest in the organized peace movement. He called attention to the duty of men of affairs to coöperate with professional men to promote practical work directed toward the perfection of an international court of justice.

MRS. MEAD gave some statistics in regard to the cost of armed peace in her usual clear and convincing manner.

## The American School Peace League.

BY FANNIE FERN ANDREWS, SECRETARY.

The holidays proved a most successful time for the organization work of the American School Peace League. Reports have been received of the formation of seven State Branches during the meetings of the respective State Teachers' Associations; while in several other States the work of the League has been presented, and strong resolutions have been passed at the State Teachers' Meetings.

The New York State Branch was organized on December 28 through the coöperation of the Peace Society of the City of New York and the Teachers' College. The occasion was a tea and reception, given at the Teachers' College, to the members of the New York State Teachers' Association. The reception later resolved itself into a meeting, at which Mr. Andrew W. Edson, Associate Superintendent of Schools of New York City, presided. After explaining the object of the meeting, Mr. Edson introduced the secretary of the American School Peace League, who spoke of the movement in which the League is interested, the general scheme of the League's organization, and its methods of work. After this address, it was voted to organize a branch of the League, and the Model Constitution for State Branches was adopted in its entirety. Dr. William H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Schools, New York City, was elected honorary president, and Andrew W. Edson, Associate Superintendent of Schools, New York City, president. The secretary is Bella Strauss, of Public School No. 188, New York City, and the treasurer, Elmer S. Redman, Hornell, N. Y.

After leaving New York, the secretary of the League attended the Southern Educational Association at Charlotte, North Carolina, and delivered an address, entitled, "The Teacher and Internationalism." An unusually strong resolution of endorsement was adopted at this meeting. A similar address was delivered by the secretary before the South Carolina Teachers' Association, and a South Carolina Branch was formed, having among its officers some of the leading educators of the State. Here, also, a strong resolution of endorsement was passed:

"Resolved, That the South Carolina State Teachers' Association endorses the work of the American School Peace League, recommends that the teachers of the State study carefully the movements towards international peace and justice, and further recommends that May the 18th be observed by the schools of the State as Peace Day."

At Charleston, South Carolina, the secretary of the League spoke to the students of the Memminger Normal School at the invitation of William K. Tate, Superintendent of Schools in Charleston, and Secretary of the Summer School Branch of the American School Peace League.

A visit was also made to Washington, where, through the efforts of Miss Lucy Patrick, two meetings had been